

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

MICHAEL DARNELL JONES,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
ESTHER GORMAN, <i>Et Al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	Civil Action No. 3:22-CV-1875-C

ORDER

Before the Court are the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge advising the Court that Plaintiff's pending motion [ECF No. 25], construed as a motion to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), should be denied. Plaintiff failed to timely file objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation.


The Court conducts a *de novo* review of those portions of the Magistrate Judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which a timely objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Portions of the report or proposed findings or recommendations that are not the subject of a timely objection will be accepted by the Court unless they are clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

The Court has conducted an independent review of the Magistrate Judge's thorough and well-reasoned findings and conclusions and finds no error. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation are hereby **ADOPTED** as the findings and

conclusions of the Court. For the reasons stated therein, Plaintiff's pending motion entitled "File Motions to Refile in Another Court who has Jurisdiction in this Matter Rule 41(b)" is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated this 6th day of November, 2023.



SAM R. CUMMINGS
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE